

REMARKS

Claims 1-2, 4-7, 9 and 11-12 are pending in the application and stand rejected

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 2, 5-7, 9 and 11-12 under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rhoads (US 6,411,725) and Narayanaswami et al. (US 2003/0011684).

Presently claim 1 recites, *inter alia*:

information attaching means for attaching different information to each of a plurality of regions in said image that respectively contain said plurality of photographed objects, and acquiring said information-attached image;

input means for receiving photographed-image data obtained by photographing an image reproducing medium, on which the information-attached image acquired by the information attaching means is reproduced, with image pick-up means; and

detection means for detecting said information from said photographed-image data for each of said plurality of photographed objects contained in said information-attached image.

The Examiner alleges Rhoads discloses most of the features of the rejected claims, but concedes Rhoads fails to disclose the transmitted image data can be the photographed image data. Thus, the Examiner applies Narayanaswami alleging it discloses this feature. The Examiner contends Narayanaswami discloses “a digital image capturing system as depicted in figure 1, numeral 100: ‘FIG. 1 is a camera (which is capable of capturing still and /or video images) . . . FIG. 1 is not limited to a camera, but may be embedded in other CPU based systems such as a portable computer or any PDA . . .’” (*citing* par. [0032]).

Applicants respectfully submit the Examiner is misconstruing the requirements of the claims. Claim 1 describes an information attaching means for attaching different information to each of plural regions of said image that contains plural photographed objects. Thus, the information attaching feature is performed relative to photographed objects (not the physical objects disclosed in Rhoads FIG. 2). The input means receives photographed image data by photographing an image reproducing medium, on which the information-attached image acquired by the information attaching means is produced. Thus, the input means for receiving photographed image data is relative to an object that is on an image reproducing medium.

The Examiner cites the general embedding of watermark content into video as teaching the information attaching means. Though the Examiner further cites the reception of the video and the decoding of video as the input receiving means, it is clear that this only corresponds to receipt of the transmitted signal, as previously contended. The Examiner's further reliance on a type of watermarking that survives printing of the image does not make up for the deficiency. In particular, the printing is the result of a digital conversion of the watermarked video signal, but there is no further image capturing of a medium on which information attached by the information attaching means is reproduced.

In other words, there is claimed an image attaching images relative to photographed subjects to obtain an information attached image (a first image), and input means for receiving a photograph of the image reproducing medium on which the information attached image acquired by the information attaching means is reproduced (a second image). The Examiner appears to agree that these features are not taught. The Examiner cites Narayanaswami to teach this feature. The Examiner contends that it would be obvious to make the combination in order to allow different formats of watermarked image distribution.

However, the obtainment of the still image discussed by Narayanaswami to provide the alternative forms of image distribution contended by the Examiner would call for the substitution of the still digital image watermark of Narayanaswami with the moving video signal discussed by Rhoads. Thus, the combination would still be deficient as to taking of a photograph of the image reproducing medium on which the information-attached image acquired by the information attaching means is reproduced.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the modification of Rhoads in view of Narayanaswami is not supportable, and even if combined, the combination would not teach all features of independent claim 1.

Consequently, Applicants submit the applied combination fails to disclose all the features recited in claim 1. Additionally, Applicants submit that because claims 7 and 9 disclose similar features, these claims are allowable, at least, for the same reasons set forth above with regard to claim 1. Finally, Applicants submit claims 2, 5, 6 and 12 are allowable, at least by virtue of their dependency.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner rejected claim 4 under § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rhoads in view of Narayanaswami, in further view of Motta et al. (US 6,726,103).

Applicants respectfully submit that because Motta, either taken alone or in combination with Rhoads and Narayanaswami, fails to compensate for the above noted deficiencies of the Rhoads/Narayanaswami as applied to claim 1 above, claim 4 is allowable, at least by virtue of its dependency.

Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

23373

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'D. Emery', written over a horizontal line.

David P. Emery
Registration No. 55,154

Date: July 10, 2008